REMARKS

Claims 1-23 remain present in this application.

The specification has been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to. Accordingly, attached hereto are proposed drawing corrections, in which the legend "RELATED ART" has been added to Figs. 1A and 1B, in accordance with the Examienr's suggestion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of any objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1, 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by HOOVER et al., U.S. Patent 4,910,420. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by DOEMEN et al., U.S. Patent 4,482,849. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 of the present application sets forth a seat for mounting a motor controller for a heat-dissipating device having a base, comprising a main body mounting on the base of the heat-dissipating device and having a slot to secure the motor controller.

In this claim 1, the seat comprises a main body mounting on a base. That is, the seat of the application is directly mounted on a base which supports the stator. HOOVER, however, teaches that a seat (integral pedestal 110) is positioned on a print circuit board 98, which is mounted on a base (housing 80) supporting a stator 72. The seat of the present application is directly mounted on a base, whereas the seat of HOOVER is disposed on a circuit board. DOEMEN also teaches that a seat (mold 54) is mounted on a circuit board 28. The seat of the present application is directly mounted on the base, rather than on the circuit board. The mounting structure of both HOOVER and DOEMEN is therefore quite different from that of the present application.

Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 of the present application recites a heat-dissipating device, comprising a base; a stator disposed on the base; a rotor surrounding the stator and coupled to the stator; a motor controller driving and controlling the heat-dissipating device; and a seat mounted on the base and having a slot to secure the motor controller.

In this claim 8, the seat is mounted on the base. That is, the seat of the application is directly mounted on a base which supports the stator. HOOVER, however, teaches that a seat (integral pedestal 110) is positioned on a print circuit board 98, which is mounted on a base (housing 80) supporting a stator 72. DOEMEN teaches that a seat (mold 54) is mounted on a circuit board 28. The

seat of the present application is directly mounted on the base, rather than on the circuit board. The mounting structure of both HOOVER and DOEMEN is therefore quite different from that of the present application.

Independent Claim 17

With regard to independent claim 17, this claim recites a heat-dissipating device, comprising a base; a stator disposed on the base; a rotor surrounding the stator and coupled to the stator; a motor controller driving and controlling the heat-dissipating device; and a seat mounted on the stator and having a slot to secure the motor controller.

In this claim 17, the seat is mounted on the stator. That is, the seat of the application is directly mounted on the stator. HOOVER teaches that a seat (integral pedestal 110) is disposed on a circuit board which joins the stator with hook 104. DOEMEN teaches that a seat (mold 54) is mounted on a circuit board 28 which joins the stator by pins 15 and 17. The seat of either HOOVER or DOEMEN is mounted on a circuit board joining the stator. The mounting structure of the present application is therefore quite different from that of the prior art utilized by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 8 and 17, as well as their dependent claims, are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

KM/asc
0941-0911P

Attachments: Replacement Drawing Sheets

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto aretwo (2) sheets of corrected drawings that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The corrected drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

In Figs. 1A and 1B, the legend "RELATED ART" has been added.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.